

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Attached drawing sheet 4/8 includes changes to Figure 4. In particular, previously omitted descriptors “Yes” and “No” have been added. This sheet replaces the original sheet 4/8.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet 4/8

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes to Original Sheet 4/8

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments to the Drawings**

Figure 4 is amended to include “Yes” and “No” indicators for the decision box 426 as suggested by the Examiner. No new subject matter is believed to have been added.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

On page 6, in paragraph [0029], “Figure 8” has been replaced with “Figure 2” as suggested.

On page 7 and page 8, “proxy cache 304” has been replaced with “proxy cache 202” where appropriate and as suggested.

On page 7, in paragraph [0033], “420” has been replaced with “419” on line 6 and replaced with “418” on line 9; and “422” has been replaced with “419”, consistent with what is shown in Figure 3.

On page 9, in paragraph [0040], the spelling of term “fulfill” has been corrected where appropriate, and step “510” has been replaced with “508” as suggested.

The Applicants note that SSL appears in paragraph [0042] rather than paragraph [0040]. The acronym SSL has been spelled out in paragraph [0042] as suggested.

No new subject matter is believed to have been added by way of these amendments.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

Claim 1 is amended to emphasize that the version control system is used in software development and to emphasize that the data stored in the cache at the proxy is obtained from the repository through communication with the central server. Claim 1 is also amended to include a version manager at the client for generating requests for versioned files through the proxy.

Claim 2 is amended by replacing “an update informer” with the expression “is configured to send an update” to characterize the feature in terms of how the central server is configured. Claim 2 is also amended to clarify the nature of the branches of proxy servers. The Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 2 obviate the need for the semicolon suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 3 is amended inserting “adapted” on line 2.

Claims 4 and 5 are amended for clarity. The Applicants respectfully submit that the

amendments obviate the need for the punctuation changes suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 6 is amended replacing “clients” with “at least one client adapted to”.

Claim 9 is amended for consistency with the above amendments.

Claim 10 is amended to address the Examiner’s concerns. It now specifies a “a plurality of chained together proxy servers adapted to serve a geographical area,” which connects to the regional proxy server, as described on page 10, line 5.

Claim 11 is amended emphasizing that the version control system is used in software development and that the central server and client are interconnected through a proxy. Steps a), b), and c) are also amended clarifying that the request from the client is made through the proxy.

Claims 13 and 14 have not been amended as suggested. The Applicants believe that the suggested colon is unnecessary and grammatically improper.

Claims 15 and 17 are amended in a manner similar to claims 1 and 11. Claim 15 is also amended inserting “and” after step c).

Claims 12-14, 16, and 18 are also amended for consistency with the above amendments.

Claim 19 is amended such that the computer-readable instructions are consistent with the amendments made to claim 1, and by inserting “and” after step b) as suggested.

Claims 20-28 are amended for consistency with the amendments made to claim 19. The Applicants believe that the suggested colon for claim 20 is unnecessary and grammatically improper.

Claim 21 is amended inserting “from said proxy” at the end of the claim.

The punctuation in claims 22-28 is also amended either as suggested by the Examiner or for consistency with the above amendments.

Claim 29 is added and is directed towards a transparent proxy. Support for new claim 29 can be found on page 10, lines 14-16.

Various other minor amendments not specifically mentioned above have been made to the claims to improve grammar and readability.

No new subject matter is believed to have been added by way of the above amendments.

### **Drawing Objections**

As noted above, “Yes” and “No” have been added to Figure 4 as suggested by the Examiner, and a replacement sheet is submitted herewith in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d).

The Applicants believe that the Examiner's objection has therefore been overcome.

### **Objections to the Specification**

As outlined above, the corrections requested by the Examiner have been made. As such, the Applicants believe that the Examiner's objections have been overcome.

### **Claim Objections**

As outlined above, the Applicants have made a number of amendments and corrections to claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 13-15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 26, and 28. The Applicants respectfully submit that these claim amendments either adopt or obviate the changes suggested by the Examiner. As such, the Applicants believe that the Examiner's objections have been overcome.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 2, 10, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Applicants believe that claims 2, 10 and 28, as amended comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as explained below.

Claim 2 has been amended replacing "update informer" with a description of the functionality of the central server, namely that it is "configured to send an update...." Support for this amendment can be found on page 7, lines 12-15.

Claims 10 and 28, as filed, comprise part of the "original disclosure" and clearly make known to one of ordinary skill in the art that "a regional proxy" is a proxy server connected between the central server and a plurality of other proxy servers in a geographic area. See, e.g., claim 10 as originally filed, lines 1-2, and claim 28 as originally filed, lines 1-2, each disclosing "a regional proxy ... connected to said central server and to a plurality of proxy server [sic, servers] in a geographic area." Further support for the meaning of "a regional proxy" can be found at page 10, lines 1-8, and on page 9, line 2, of the specification as originally filed. The Applicants respectfully submit that these original passages from the application as filed make clear to one of ordinary skill in the art what is meant by a "regional proxy." The Applicant has also made some clarifying amendments to claims 10 and 28. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection of claims 10 and 28.

In view of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 10, and 28 comply

with 35 U.S.C. 112.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1-5 and 17-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jungck et al. (US 7,114,008). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as follows.

The present application is directed to a version control system used in software development, and to components thereof that use a proxy to handle requests from a client to a central server. The central server is responsible for making all modifications and the proxy handles all requests from the client. The proxy reduces load on the central server since the server only needs to be concerned with modifications and not handling each request from the client. The client uses a version manager for making the requests, which also reduces network traffic between the proxy and the central server.

Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize that the version control system is used in software development. The interconnections and roles for the server, proxy and client have also been clarified. The Applicants believe that claim 1 now clearly reflects that the central server controls all modifications to the files while the proxy controls traffic to the server by handling requests made by the client using the version manager.

Jungck teaches an architecture for intercepting and processing packets in a network. Jungck does not teach version control for software development, but rather teaches an arrangement for DNS translation and routing using a client, server and intermediary proxy. The Applicants believe that the Examiner has read too much into Jungck as Jungck is not concerned with version control but is entirely silent in that regard.

Therefore, although Jungck discloses a client-proxy-server arrangement, Jungck has not recognized how a proxy can be used with a version control system to reduce load on the server as recognized by the Applicants. As such, Jungck deals with an entirely different problem. In fact, Jungck does not teach of versioned files and clearly does not teach at least one element recited in claim 1. As such, Jungck cannot anticipate claim 1.

As noted above, claims 17 and 19 have been amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and, as such, similar arguments apply. Claims 2-5, 18 and 19-23 being ultimately dependent upon claims 1, 17 and 19 respectively are also believed to distinguish over Jungck for at least that reason.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claims 1-5 and 17-23 are not anticipated by Jungck.

Claims 11-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haikin (US 6,757,893). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as follows.

As discussed above, claim 11 has been amended to specify the interconnection of the client and server through a proxy.

Haikin describes a version control system having a number of workstations connected directly to a server and does not proxy requests from the client.

Haikin therefore does not teach at least the step of requesting from the central server through the proxy, a lock on a version of a file as recited in claim 11. As such, Haikin does not teach every element of claim 11 and cannot anticipate.

Claims 12-14 are dependent on claim 11 and for at least that reason are also believed to distinguish over Haikin.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 6-10, 15, 16 and 24-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jungck in view of Allen et al. (US 5,675,802). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as follows.

Firstly, Applicant notes that Allen does not teach of handling requests for versioned files used in software development through a proxy. Rather, Allen teaches a development system comprising a number of geographically distributed sites connected to a main storage device.

Claims 6-10 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, and the Applicants are believed to have shown above that Jungck clearly does not teach managing versioned files used in software development. Further, Allen must not only teach what is missing from Jungck but there also must be some suggestion and/or motivation to combine the references (MPEP 2143).

Although Allen mentions versioned files, Allen does not utilize a proxy. Jungck does not mention versioned files and in fact is entirely silent regarding software development. Moreover, neither reference teaches requesting a versioned file through a proxy. Therefore, the combination of Jungck and Allen does not teach every element of claim 1 (let alone claims 6-10).

As discussed, Jungck is concerned with routing packets in a network through a proxy, but is entirely silent regarding software development and versioned files therefor. Also, Allen is entirely silent regarding the use of a proxy. The Applicants believe that there is no suggestion or direction for modifying either reference to include the features recited in claim 1, since the references are clearly directed to entirely different types of technology. In fact, as discussed, the Applicants believe that the Jungck reference would likely not even be considered as it clearly does not deal with managing versioned files. Similarly, since Allen does not mention using a proxy, and since the technology described by Jungck does not relate to managing versioned files, there is no commonality that would lead a person skilled in the art to consider the references together. Moreover, there is no direction in Jungck as to how a proxy used for handling network packets would be applicable to managing versioned files. Neither reference has recognized how the benefits of a proxy can be applied to a version control system as recognized by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants believe that claims 6-10 by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1, clearly distinguish over Jungck in view of Allen.

As noted above, claim 15 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1 and thus similar arguments with respect to the cited references equally apply. Claim 16 being dependent on claim 15 is also believed to distinguish over the references for at least that reason.

Claims 24-28 are dependent on claim 19, which has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Therefore, the above arguments equally apply to claims 24-27.

In view of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-10, 15, 16 and 24-28 are patentably distinguished over Jungck in view of Allen.

[THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

## Summary

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants believe that none of the references cited by the Examiner teach of handling requests for versioned files through a proxy as recited in the claims. As such, claims 1-29 are believed to distinguish over the references cited. The Applicants also believe that all objections raised have been overcome. Therefore, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The Applicants requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Reed Heimbecher#36353/

Reed R. Heimbecher  
Registration No. 36,353  
Brett J. Slaney  
Registration No. 58,772

Date: 7 February 2007